

This fax is of total 8-pages
without fax cover sheet.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 09 2009

Suresh Patel

37 Miller Street
Toronto, Ontario M6N 2Z6
Email: trutth@yahoo.com; CANADA

April 9, 2009

Commissioner of Patents (USPTO)
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment
401 Dulany Street
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314 - 1450
USA
Phone: (1-703) 305 31 65 (applications)
Patent Central Fax Number: 571-273-8300

9-1-571-273-8300

Subject: Response to Examination Report on application # 10/570023 (PCT/CA2003/001312) by examiner Crystal J. Barnes Bullock mailed on January 12, 2009

Ref: Application # 10/570023 (PCT/CA2003/001312): System of Super Super Decoupled Loadflow Computation for Electrical Power System

Dear Sir/Madam,

The following documents were received at USPTO on March 1, 2006, which was accompanied by a cover letter dated February 23, 2006.

1. Amended copy of description, claims, abstract, and 7-figures of my application no. PCT/CA2003/001312 (51-pages)
2. A marked-up in red ink copy of contents of item-1 above for amendment against as filed and published contents of the application PCT/CA2003/001312 (26-pages with content on both sides)
3. Filled and signed: Recordation form cover sheet (form PTO-1595), Transmittal letter to the United States (PTO-1390), Credit Card Payment Form (PTO-2038), Declaration for Utility or Design Patent Applications (PTO/SB/01), and Correspondence address indication form (PTO/SB/81) (8-pages)

Office Action Summary mailed on January 12, 2009 correctly identifies that the Office Action by the examiner Crystal J. Barnes Bullock was based on communication received at USPTO on 01 March 2006.

Enclosed please find:

1. 20-amended claims presented in ascending numerical order, and which are provided with status identifiers. Pending claims 1-11 referred to in Office Action Summary

Sureshchandra B. Patel, Application # 10/570023 (PCT/CA2003/001312), Response Exam Report 12 Jan 2009 1

mailed on January 12, 2009 were as filled claims, and the examiner seems not to have examined amended claims 1-9 that reached USPTO on March 01, 2006. Considering total number of pending claims to be 1-11, the largest number of claims, having regarded amended claims 1-9 that reached USPTO on March 01, 2006 are not valid because they were not in ascending numerical order and without proper identifiers. In order to rewrite the claims all the pending claims 1-11 are deleted, and amended claims are provided as new claims 12-20. (6-pages).

Claim-1 to 11: (Deleted)

Claim-12 to 20: (New)


This acceptable possibility was verified in my telephonic talk, which carries the reference # 1136559446, with USPTO on November 26, 2008 at about 1200 to 1230. Moreover, my personal attempt to talk with both the examiner her supervisor were not successful, and left message.

This response is prepared based on Sample Format for Revised Amendment Practice (Rev. 6/03), therefore page numbers of the listing of claims are in continuation with this cover letter, and not in continuation with the amended specification copy of description, claims, abstract, and 7-figures of my application # 10/570023 (PCT/CA2003/001312) that reached USPTO on March 01, 2006.

I also would like to bring to an attention of the examiner that drawings were not filed on 17 June 2008, but they were part of the communication filed on 01 March 2006. Priority claim was withdrawn for this application.

Hope, this response will meet the requirements at the USPTO.

Yours Sincerely,



Suresh Patel

Enclosures: Amended claims 1-20 listed in ascending order (6-Pages) + this cover letter (2-pages)
= total 8-pages